

**VAN HOVEN DECL.
ISO OPPOSITION TO INTUITIVE'S
MOTION TO REOPEN DISCOVERY**

EXHIBIT 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL ROBOT) Lead Case No.:
ANTITRUST LITIGATION,) 3:21-cv-03825-VC

-----)
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:)
ALL CASES)
-----)

SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE)
COMPANY, INC.,) Case No.
) 3:21-cv-03496-VC

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,)

Defendant.)
-----)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

REMOTE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
DEPOSITION OF STAN HAMILTON
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2022

REPORTED BY NANCY J. MARTIN
CSR. NO. 9504, RMR, RPR
PAGES 1 - 112

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL ROBOT) Lead Case No.:
ANTITRUST LITIGATION,) 3:21-cv-03825-VC

-----)
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:)
ALL CASES)
-----)

SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE)
COMPANY, INC.,) Case No.
) 3:21-cv-03496-VC

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,)

Defendant.)
-----)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

- - -

Friday, November 4, 2022

- - -

Remote Deposition of STAN HAMILTON
beginning at 11:14 a.m., before Nancy J. Martin, a
Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Shorthand
Reporter. All parties appeared remotely.

A P P E A R A N C E S :

ALEXANDER ERWIG, ESQ.
DOVEL & LUNER LLP
201 Santa Monica Boulevard
Suite 600
Santa Monica, California 90401
alexander@dovel.com
Counsel for the Deponent

JEFFREY J. CORRIGAN, ESQ.
JEFFREY SPECTOR, ESQ.
SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF PC
2001 Market Street
Suite 3420
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
jcorrigan@srkattorneys.com
(215) 496-0300
Counsel for the hospital plaintiffs

ANDREW D. LAZEROW, ESQ.
ANNA BOBROW, ATTORNEY AT LAW
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 662-5081
alazerow@cov.com
Counsel for Intuitive Surgical Inc.

DONNY K. SAMPORNA, ESQ.
HALEY GUILIANO LLP
111 North Market Street
Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
(669) 213-1080
donny.samporna@hglaw.com
Counsel for Surgical Instrument Service, Incorporated

ALSO PRESENT:

WILL DAVIS, LEGAL VIDEOGRAPHER

1 MR. CORRIGAN: Okay. So I'm going to -- I'm
2 sorry to the court reporter -- well, actually, I don't
3 need to know because I am going to reveal this
4 document, and it looks like this is going to be
5 Plaintiff's Document 204. So I'm marking this as
6 Document 204.

7 Q. Do you see that Mr. Hamilton?

8 (Deposition Exhibit 204 was marked for
9 identification.)

10 THE WITNESS: I see a 204. I presume I click
11 on either the document name or the number?

12 BY MR. CORRIGAN:

13 Q. Yeah.

14 A. Never mind. It's coming up now. I see it
15 now.

16 Q. I just hit the magic button saying, "Show
17 this document to the witness."

18 Do you recognize that document?

19 A. Oh, yes.

20 Q. What document is that?

21 A. This is the -- this is the later -- this is
22 July '22 -- I don't know, but this was the letter that
23 we received that Anthony Lee sent to walk back this --
24 the term I would use, the earlier E-mails that we were
25 looking at that were in that chain, after other people

1 in the FDA, including higher level people got
2 involved, then we received this letter to kind of walk
3 back a term decision, implying that FDA had made a
4 regulatory determination, which they had not.

5 Q. In your mind, how does this E-mail affect all
6 the other E-mails that you read earlier with
7 Mr. Lazerow?

8 A. It negates anything that they were appearing
9 to do with respect to a regulatory determination or
10 regulatory enforcement, and that was made clear in the
11 last meeting that the timing was before this, and that
12 included some fairly high people in the FDA. And it
13 was clear that the walk back was occurring and that
14 only an informal assessment was made. The materials
15 were limited, meaning that those statements that were
16 made by Dr. Lee saying, "I think you didn't do this or
17 that" were based on not even actually seeing any of
18 that information, and informal communications do not
19 represent formal position and do not bind or otherwise
20 obligate or commit the agency to the views expressed,
21 meaning there was nothing for Rebotix to appeal at
22 this time.

23 So what had happened is we were going to
24 appeal this because we felt like we had some very,
25 very good reasons to appeal what Anthony Lee was

1 saying, but again, he was just a -- not a particularly
2 high level person. He was saying a lot of things that
3 then got walked back, and you can see the result.

4 MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Hamilton.
5 That's all the questions I have for now.

6 THE WITNESS: Okay.

7

8 FURTHER EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. LAZEROW:

10 Q. Mr. Hamilton, by the time that Rebotix
11 received this E-mail that we're looking at on
12 Plaintiff's Exhibit 204 from Mr. Lee, had Rebotix
13 decided that it was proceeding with plans to submit a
14 510(k) application?

15 A. There was discussion of it. There was no
16 decision, and there was no actual activity to -- to
17 submit.

18 Q. After this E-mail, am I right, Rebotix
19 decided that it would proceed with plans to submit a
20 510(k) application?

21 MR. ERWIG: Objection to form.

22 THE WITNESS: No.

23 BY MR. LAZEROW:

24 Q. Can you look please, sir, at Document No. 9
25 in your folder of hard copy documents, marked Document